

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as currently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 4-14, and 27-28 are currently pending. Claims 11-13, 24-26 and 28 have been withdrawn from consideration. The present Amendment amends Claims 1, 4, 5, 8, 14, 17, 18, 21 and 27 and cancels Claims 2, 3, 15 and 16 without prejudice or disclaimer. The changes and additions to the claims are supported by the originally filed application. No new matter has been added. The specification has been amended to correct informalities.

In the outstanding Office Action, the title was objected to as not descriptive; the abstract of the disclosure was objected to because of informalities; Claims 1, 3, 7, 8, 14, 16, 20, 21, and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Kita (U.S. Patent No. 5,172,103); Claims 5 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Kita; Claims 2, 4, 15, and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Kita in view of Kaji et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0018136, herein "Kaji"); and Claims 6, 9, 10, 19, 22, and 23 were objected to but noted as allowable if rewritten in independent form. Applicant appreciatively acknowledges the indication that Claims 6, 9, 10, 19, 22 and 23 contain allowable subject matter.

Neither Kita nor Kaji disclose a control unit which recognizes types of preset output video signals and types of image data expanded in a free memory and decides whether or not magnification alteration should be performed in accordance with types of the output video signals and types of image data, as in amended independent Claim 1 or controlling a decision as to whether or not magnification alteration should be performed in accordance with types of the output video signals and types of the image data and for recognizing types of preset output video signals and types of image data expanded in a frame memory as in amended independent Claims 14 and 27.

Instead, Kita describes magnification of the inputting and outputting images. Kita uses the same image data for the inputting and outputting images. Therefore, the images become blurred as the magnification gets higher because only simple magnification alteration is performed.

Kaji relates to the process of enlargement of a part of the image and uses the same image data. As a result, the images become blurred as the magnification gets higher.

Neither Kita nor Kaji perform processing in accordance with the type of images. In Claims 1, 14 and 27 magnification alteration is performed in accordance with the type of images. The type of images may include a natural image taken by a CCD and graphic images obtained via a communication section such as an e-mail or web browser. See, e.g., Fig. 1.

With respect to dependent Claim 5, although Kita deals with a plurality of different images which are obtained from MRI or SPECT, the plurality of different images are not natural images as in Claim 5. Therefore, in Kita, it is impossible to decide whether or not magnification alteration should be performed in accordance with the type of image data. Kita fails to disclose or suggest this feature.

With respect to dependent Claim 7, Kita discloses that if the number of pixels is the same as the displaying section, it does not perform magnification processing in step 206. Therefore, Kita fails to disclose or suggest deciding whether or not magnification alteration should be performed in accordance with types of image data.

With respect to dependent Claim 8, Kita does not disclose a memory section which, in advance, stores images having the same number of pixels as the display section. Because Kita performs magnification alteration in real time, it requires no memory section.

Furthermore, dependent Claims 4-10 and 17-23 depend from Claims 1 and 14 respectively. As discussed above Claims 1 and 14 recite patentable subject matter.

Therefore, Claims 4-10 and 17-23 are patentable at least for the reasons discussed above as well as for the individual features they recite.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment, no further issues are believed to be outstanding in the present application, and the present application is believed to be in condition for formal Allowance. A Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner deem that any further action is necessary to place this application in even better form for allowance, the Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the below listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Gregory J. Maier
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 25,599

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)

Surinder Sachar
Registration No. 34,423